was noted to be of rather frequent occurrence there. This striking plant exhibits a coloring not common in our spring flowers.—MARCEL RAYMOND, Montreal Botanical Garden.

A MOST USEFUL SERIES OF ILLUSTRATIONS.—The new venture, DRAWINGS OF BRITISH PLANTS[1], will interest all in North America who wish good illustrations of a large proportion of our naturalized flowering plants, for it is to Britain and continental Europe that we are indebted for a large proportion of the plants which, beginning early in the 17th century, have more and more monopolized our disturbed or cleared areas. In fact, during the International Congress at Ithaca in 1926, the European delegates (Borza, Briquet, Chodat, Domin, Hill, Rendle, Svedelius, Wettstein and others) urged the present writer to take them where they could see some truly American plants. All which they had seen about the streets and fields near Ithaca were the common ruderal and agrestal weeds so familiar to them at home! Drawn by a discerning artist, with an eye for technical details of the species, the illustrations should be of utmost service to our floristic and taxonomic students, in showing exactly what the British plant is like, although it must not be overlooked that the plant found in Britain may sometimes differ from that described by Linnaeus or others from outside Britain; and, furthermore, that many European species, adventive with us, first reached us from the Mediterranean or other areas not British. These illustrations, then, are important for us, because in technical groups it is always possible that we have misidentified some of our species. The drawings will, therefore, help set us straight.

Not only our adventive or introduced weeds can thus be checked by those who lack abundant European material. The amphigean plants, native of northern or temperate regions, can be compared. The British *Anemone Pulsatilla*, *Myosurus minimus*, *Ranunculus trichophyllus*, *circinatus* or *reptans* and countless others can now be checked by anyone against their North American representatives; and now for the first time we can, possibly, clear the identities of the plants known with us as *Fumaria officinalis*, for that inclusive series is here illustrated as 10 different species and their reputed specific distinctions shown. It would be a great boon to the user, however, if there were something like diagnoses or keys and if the authenticity of the specimens illustrated were in some way indicated. The letter-file of the present writer contains a note from an outstanding English taxonomist, anxious to prove that a certain British plant is not conspecific with the American one to which it had been referred, pointing out that careful drawings of our plant in American monographs were of no value because the specimens drawn were not cited! In the new British work one has to put the same faith in the exact identity of the plant drawn as he does in many earlier illustrations of quite different plants under the names here used. In the new work, for instance in the case of Part II, plate 18, it is possible to meet difficulties. Without a key one becomes puzzled, for in the habit-sketch (under *Fumaria*) the bracts are shown chiefly as denticulate along the upper margin, but in fig. B the enlarged bract is drawn with this margin entire. Which is correct? Perhaps *Fumaria* is not finally solved.

The foreword to the series is written by Sir Edward Salisbury, Director of the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew. Consequently, the recent ruling of Sir Edward that the scholarly practice of Kew botanists (as well as such respected

[1] *Drawings of British Plants* by STELLA ROSS-CRAIG, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. Foreword by Sir Edward Salisbury. Part I. Ranunculaceae; part II. Berberidaceae, Nymphaeaceae, Papaveraceae, Fumariaceae. June, 1948. G. Bell & Sons Ltd., York House, Portugal Street, London, W. C. 2. Pt. I 6 s. net; pt. II 4 s. 6 d. net.

taxonomists as Linnaeus, Lamarck, Willdenow, the DeCandolles, the Hookers, Bentham, Eichler, Kunth, Torrey, Gray and countless others) for many decades, of capitalizing the initial letter of personal specific names, must be abandoned, is here put into practice. This, it is assumed, is supposed to be "progressive"[1]. The results of the abandonment of capital initials for personal specific names may often be unfortunate. Thus, again referring to *Fumaria*, the species, *F. Bastardii*, was named by Boreau in honor of the great French botanist, TOUSSAINT BASTARD but, deprived of its capital initial, the name seems more a dishonor than an honor and one gets the impression that the parents of the distinguished botanist of Angers were blindly optimistic in selecting the given name Tous-saint!

But these little details aside, the new series of Drawings is bound to be most helpful and it will be almost as much needed in America as in Britain.—M. L. F.

OPHRYDIUM; A CORRECTION.—Through an error of the Editors the text-figures on page 5 were called "UNIDENTIFIED OPHRYDIUM". The caption should have been:

FIGS.: 1, individual, OPHRYDIUM animals; 2, animal condensing to a telotroch; 3, telotrochs or free swimming individuals; 4, telotrochs in resting state; 5, individual in process of binary fission?

Readers are asked to note this correction.—EDS.

[1] See note on this subject in RHODORA xlix. 79–81 (1947).

Volume 51, no. 601, including pages 1–12, was issued 19 January, 1949.